REMARKS

Claims 3-24 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, claims 5, 6, 13 and 22 are amended. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims and the rejections/objections in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Claims

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 6. In response, claims 5 and 6 are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 12. Claims 7 and 11 depend from allowed independent claims 5 and 6, respectively, and thus are allowable.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 3, 4, 8 and 10-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishii (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0153310, hereinafter "Ishii"), and claim 9 is rejected under 5 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and thus, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 12 recites a handling method after updating of privacy profile of a target UE, and the method comprises:

> when a location service (LCS) system is aware that privacy profile of the
> target UE was updated, for a deferred location request in activated state against
> the target UE, the deferred location request being from a LCS client requesting
> for location information of the target UE, the LCS system performing a privacy
> check based on the update privacy profile of the target UE;
> if the deferred location request passes the privacy check, the LCS system
> continuing to handle the deferred location request;

otherwise, if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request.

Applicant respectfully submits that the new reference Ishii fails to disclose or teach, either expressly or impliedly, each and every element of independent claim 12.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that Ishii fails to disclose or teach the elements "when a location service (LCS) system is aware that privacy profile of the target UE was updated, for a deferred location request in activated state against the target UE, the deferred location request being from a LCS client requesting for location information of the target UE, the LCS system performing a privacy check based on the update privacy profile of the target UE" of claim 12. As shown above, claim 12 defines that (1) the LCS system performs a privacy check on the deferrer location request against the target UE when aware of the update of the privacy profile of the target UE, and (2) that the privacy check on the deferred location request is based on the updated privacy profile of the target UE. With respect to the new reference Ishii, even if Ishii mentions determining whether the privacy settings of the target UE terminal have been altered (see paragraph [0052] and FIG. 9, step 351, which are also cited by the Office Action), Ishii **fails to** disclose or teach that a privacy check is performed on any location request after/if the privacy settings of the target UE terminal are altered, and thus/also **fails to** disclose or teach that the privacy check on the location request is based on the altered privacy settings of the target UE terminal. In contrast, in Ishii, if the privacy settings have been altered, the home GLMC determines whether the altered settings relate only to location information. Furthermore, nowhere does Ishii disclose or teach that a privacy check on any location request is done if/after the privacy settings are altered, or the privacy check after the alteration of the privacy setting is based on the altered privacy settings.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Ishii also fails to anticipate the elements "if the deferred location request passes the privacy check, the LCS system continuing to handle the deferred location request; otherwise, if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request" of claim 12. Firstly, as already discussed above, as Ishii fails to anticipate the similar elements when aware of the update of the privacy profile of the target UE, the LCS system performing a privacy check on a deferred location request based on the update privacy profile as recited in claim 12, it is not possible that Ishii discloses whether the deferred location passes the privacy check which is based on the updated profile privacy. Thus, Ishii does not disclose that if the deferred location request passes the privacy check, the LCS system continuing to handle the deferred location request; otherwise, if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request as recited in claim 12.

Furthermore, as shown above, in claim 12, <u>if the deferred location request passes the privacy check</u> (which is based on the updated privacy profile), the LCS system continues to handle the deferred location request. In contrast, Ishii discloses that <u>if the privacy settings of the target UE terminal have been altered</u>, the home GLMC proceeds to wait for location information of the target UE (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0052], FIG. 9, steps 351 and 316). Clearly, the conditions under which the home GLMC of Ishii waiting for the location information of the target UE are different from that of the LCS system continuing to handle the deferred location request in claim 12.

Additionally, as shown above, in claim 12, <u>if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check</u>, a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request is initialized by the

LCS system. In contrast, Ishii discloses that <u>if the altered privacy settings of the target UE</u> <u>terminal do not exclusively relate to location information, the home GLMC determines</u> **whether** <u>cancellation of the event-triggered location request is required and if cancellation is required</u>, a cancellation request is sent to the SGSN/MSC to cancel the event-triggered location request (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0053], FIG. 9, step 354, which also be cited by the Office Action). Clearly, the general condition/reason under which the cancellation procedure is performed in Ishii is very different from that in claim 12. In addition, if the altered privacy settings of the target UE terminal do not exclusively relate to location information, Ishii just states if cancellation is required, cancel the event-triggered location request, but does not clearly disclose or teach when the cancellation is required. Accordingly, Ishii fails to disclose the "if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check, the LCS system initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request" as defined in claim 12.

Therefore, at least for any reason discussed above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ishii does not disclose each and every element of or render obvious claim 12. Thus, claim 12 is believed to be allowable over the references of record.

Claims 3, 4, 8-10 and 13-15 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 12 and add further elements or additional limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the references of record at least in view of their dependence on an allowable claim.

Independent claim 16 recites a method in a communication network for handling a location request, and comprises when a stored privacy profile of a target UE was updated, performing a privacy check on the deferred location request based on the updated privacy profile of the target UE to verify whether the client is allowed to locate the target UE, if the client is not

allowed to locate the target UE, initiating a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request, if the client is allowed to locate the target UE, continuing to handle the deferred location request.

Independent claim 21 recites a communication network and recites when a stored privacy profile of the target UE was updated, the location system is adapted to perform a privacy check on a deferred location request in activated stated against the target UE, the deferred location request being from the client for requesting location information of the target UE, to initiate a cancellation procedure to the deferred location request if the deferred location request passes the privacy check and to continue handling of the deferred location request if the deferred location request does not pass the privacy check.

Claims 16 and 21 are independent claims, and while of different scope, recite similar recitations to those discussed above for claim 12, and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 17-20 and claim 22-24 depend from independent claims 16 and 22, respectively, and thus are allowable over the references of record.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

November 5, 2010
Date

/Brian A. Carlson /
Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,793

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Ste. 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218